

CGMAC Next Steps

May 5, 1999

- Discuss some zoning tools and strategies identified at the Citywide Workshop.
- Review the list below and suggest additions, deletions, and additional comments.
- Which items should be bundled together for recommended rezoning?
- What are the higher priority items for moving forward?

| TOOLS | COMMENTS | HOW PACKAGED | PRIORITY |
|--|---|---|-----------------|
| Transit Oriented Development (relatively high density near transit) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Problems in different squares e.g. Porter Customize for each square Need for community support, particularly in areas with high potential e.g. Alewife | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Group Red Line stations and Lechmere (Green Line) FAR/Density Site Design | |
| Parking Limits through Zoning | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Determine minimum threshold (how low can we go?) Concern about spillover Attach FAR to parking (only above grade?) Address marketing difficulties with less parking IRS Rules re. parking as a monetary benefit in areas where parking is a premium | | |
| Performance Rules to limit traffic impacts e.g. trip generation 20% below Cambridge-adjusted ITE rates; evaluation of impacts on neighborhood streets | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If impact of a new development, with mitigation, is greater than 'x', reduce gross floor area Address change in use over time – could require certificate of occupancy for change of use Needed since new businesses are not always sensitive to local needs and issues. | | |
| \$ Contribution to transportation access system (based on square footage of development) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TMA's open to the public to make them more viable Just hits new development If it is important, should the City contribute? Sp. for public access component. What kind of employer? – Large established firms like John Hancock (not much public support @workshop) or startups? | | |
| Inclusionary Zoning for Moderate Income Families | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs City administration. | | |
| Requiring ____% of Housing in New Mixed-Use Zones | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More incentive based rather than mandatory | | |
| Replace Business and Industry Districts with Residential Uses | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Location sensitive based on its ability to withstand additional traffic e.g. do housing in areas less well served by transit. | | |
| Additional Density Bonuses for Housing | | | |
| More University housing would help the overall housing market | | | |
| Adopt Zoning to Encourage Small-Scale Mixed-Use | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|--|-----|
| Development | | | |
| FAR Caps, not to exceed ____ | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nowhere in the city should the FAR exceed ____; or in all areas with FAR over ____, reduce the permitted FAR by ____%? | | |
| Transfer of Development Rights | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What does it mean for residents – less predictability about what may happen in the neighborhood. | | Low |
| \$ Contribution to Open Space Acquisition Fund (based on square footage of development) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New development Greater open ____ \$ -- how to invest for max. return? Recreational model e.g. Mt. Auburn | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |